

Remarks

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 12, 2006. Claims 1-21 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. Claims 1-7, 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selitzer in view of either Fincke et al or Gorynin et al.

Both Gorynin and Fincke cited by the Examiner belong to the so-called "flame spray" type of method, which introduces thermally reactive powder into a plasma flame to deposit a layer of materials on the substrate of the product being treated. Such method cannot be used to clean the surface of a workpiece as the present invention can because of the deposition of the materials generated from the reactive powder (reactants) on the surface of the workpiece. Furthermore, unlike the present invention, there is no chemical reaction happening on the surface of the workpiece in either Gorynin or Fincke. In addition, there is no teaching in either Gorynin or Fincke on how the flame can be self-sustained via combustion without external excitation as the present invention can. Since Selitzer does not teach the production of a flame via combustion either, Selitzer, in view of either Gorynin or Fincke cannot anticipate independent claims 1-3, 16-19, and 21. Since claims 4-7 and 9-15 depend on claim 3, and claim 20 depends on claim 19, Selitzer in view of either Gorynin or Fincke cannot anticipate claims 1-7, 9-21, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selitzer in view of either Gorynin et al or Fincke et al as applied to claims 1-7, 9-21 above, and further in view of Wagner. The patent to Wagner is relied on to set forth use of a flame suppressor, as set forth on page 3 in the prior office action.

Wagner teaches using a flame suppressor for a safer device and thus cannot anticipate a torch "operable to produce a flame via combustion" claimed in independent claim 3. As discussed in the previous section, Selitzer in view of either Gorynin or Fincke cannot anticipate independent claim 3 either. Since claim 8 depends on claim 3, it cannot be rendered obvious over Selitzer in view of either Gorynin or Fincke and further in view of Wagner, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to claim 8 be withdrawn.

### II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

1. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Fincke et al.

Fincke teaches thermal conversion of reactants inside a reactor chamber and deposits the resulting gaseous stream on the surface of the workpiece. Unlike the present invention, it cannot be used to clean or modify the surface of the workpiece and there is no chemical reaction happening on the surface of the workpiece. Therefore, Fincke cannot anticipate the present invention in independent claims 1-3, 16-19, and 21. Since claims 4-7 and 9-13 depend on claim 3, and claim 20 depends on claim 19, Fincke cannot anticipate claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-21, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gorynin.

Gorynin teaches preparing an adhesive layer by impinging exotherming powders on a substrate of the workpiece. Unlike the present invention, it cannot be used to clean or modify the

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

surface of the workpiece and there is no chemical reaction happening on the surface of the workpiece. Therefore, Gorynin cannot anticipate the present invention in independent claims 1-3, 16-19, and 21. Since claims 4-7 and 9-13 depend on claim 3, and claim 20 depends on claim 19, Gorynin cannot anticipate claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-21, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.


### III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/12/06

By:   
David T. Xue  
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928  
Customer No.: 23910

- 9 -

Attorney Docket No.: CARR-01003US1 SRM/DTX  
M:\DXue\wp\Carr\1003us1\1003us1.Reply to OA mailed 1-12-06.doc